

MTEC Meeting Minutes

April 27-28, 2000
Holiday Inn University Plaza Hotel
Springfield, MO

Thursday, April 27, 2000

Chair Patti Penny called the meeting to order at approximately 1 p.m. with a welcome to Council members, staff and guests. She then introduced new additions to Council membership. Michele Ohmes from the City of Kansas City and member of the Governor's Council on Disability replaces Edna Freeman. Elaine West, Director of the Missouri Association for Community Action, replaces Lanny Ellis. Catherine Leapheart, Director of the Division of Employment Security, replaces Karla McLucas. Finally, Dr. Wayne Giles with the Metropolitan Community Colleges in Kansas City replaces Dr. Dale Gibson.

Patti gave a brief report from the prior day's Parliamentary Training, given by Terry Heiman with the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. She thanked Council members and staff for attending, as the session was very informative. The session would assist in conducting Council meetings more in accordance with accepted rules of order. She mentioned that the agenda as presented did not require approval, but objections would be noted. Chair Patti Penny then added the National Toll-Free Help Line for employers and dislocated workers to the agenda under the Evaluation and Awards Committee report.

Patti asked Council members present and guests introduce themselves. She then called for approval of the minutes. As there were no corrections, the minutes would stand as submitted. The Marketing Committee report was given by Jim Dickerson. Jim mentioned that decision on a new Workforce Development System logo continued to be in process, but that a recommendation would be forthcoming at the June meeting. Workforce Development Staff and Marketing Committee members will meet to make recommendations for a logo to be posted on the Internet in the form of a survey.

George Eberle followed with the Special Focus Committee Report on Diversity. He referenced Council prior approval of \$5000 for Diversity Forum meetings and stated specifications were to be drawn up to address the purpose, location, logistics, etc. for a Request for Proposal framework. The Committee will then ask if certain organizations representing identified diversity groups would like to create, operate and manage further meetings with funding from the \$5000 to go to such an effort. Information from these meetings will be reported back to the Council with the focus group findings.

George then reported for Special Focus Committee on the issue of Regional Planning. He mentioned that one local plan had been presented to the Committee thus far, and that was from the Jefferson-Franklin Consortium. The Committee's responsibility to the local plan review was to ensure that the plans submitted addressed the three questions as approved by the Council in August of 1999. The questions addressed the following areas: identification of other workforce related planning agencies, how the WIA as planned in each area responds to

the needs of these other entities, and how responding to these needs will be used to achieve WIA outcomes and information sharing. The Committee recommended approval of the plan from the standpoint of regional planning, with the note that further work was needed in the area of three questions, and passed the plan to the Program Coordination Committee. George then referenced the conclusion of the Executive Committee that questions, as set forth in August, approved in October of 1999 and reaffirmed in December, must be answered. If the questions were not satisfactorily answered by the submitted local plans, they would not be considered as having met requirements of the Council for approval.

Ron Breshears then gave the report for the Strategic Planning Committee. Ron briefly reviewed the strategy updates and identified key issues for the Committee. The key issues for Strategy 1 include job seekers needs for childcare. Bob Hall gave a report to the Committee on how DFS is expanding services in this area. Additionally, in the Employment Security area, they are looking into putting in a toll-free line for claimants to ask questions in this area. Strategy 2 regarding short-term training is almost complete. Regarding Strategy 3, financial incentives for employers and employees, there have been changes in the legislation for individual training accounts that could ensure a more workable process. Regarding Strategy 4, making the One-Stop System as the primary entry point to the state's workforce system, there have been numerous capacity building efforts for local areas and partners. These include cross training, customer satisfaction, cultural/disability bias and skills development training. Strategy 5, regarding increase of small business profitability, has seen increase in information and training sharing between personnel and WIA area with the groups who represent and sell private industry. It is hoped that tasks in this area will be completed by June 30, although information sharing must be ongoing. Strategy 6 regarding outcome measures and Strategy 7 regarding implementation of the Workforce Investment were referenced as items to be covered in presentations on the agenda.

Fred Grayson then reported for the Evaluation and Awards Committee. He moved that the Committee be re-authorized to initiate the Governor's Awards and Alumni-of-the-Year process for the Governor's Conference on Workforce Development in October 2000. The Committee will be composed of the Evaluation and Awards members plus other interested Council members. The Committee will consider what will most closely reflect the intent of the Workforce Investment Act and provide categories for awards to be reported to the Full Council in June. The motion was seconded. The motion passed unanimously. Virginia Mee then gave an update on the February 2000 research report from the University of Missouri on initiatives related to Governor's outcomes for the Workforce Development System. The report was included in the binder, in addition to the agenda item summary. The report included research findings and progress toward meeting the goals established by MTEC in September 1997. The report included findings of 339,779 individuals from PY 95 and 309,087 individuals from PY 96 who came in contact with at least one of the four workforce development programs, including: Vocational Rehabilitation, JTPA, FUTURES and Employment Security. The goals for PY 98 are:

- 55% of those coming in contact with the system get a job sometime within a year of completion,
- 85% of those coming in contact with the system are working 6, 9 and 12 months later,

- 56% of those participating in one of the four programs received higher earnings after participation, and
- 25% of those participating in one of the four programs raised themselves above the poverty line after completion of their programs.

The data from the analysis suggest that the workforce development system is making progress toward the goals to be achieved. MTEC's research initiative will continue analyzing PY 97 and 98 participants in the system, as data becomes available. It will also continue to work to identify combinations of services to help citizens succeed in achieving the four outcomes, and will develop a methodology related to learning more about the benefits of the state's investment in its workforce development system. Discussion followed. Ken Troske, from the University of Missouri, answered Council questions regarding analysis of programs by each workforce investment area and to what extent economical factors were or were not perceived to affect the outcomes. George suggested that in the Council's report to the Governor, reference be made to the 5th question, although findings are incomplete.

Fred then mentioned that state staffs continue to proceed in developing an Accountability Matrix for identifying common performance measures and definitions. A report will be given at a later meeting, once details of the matrix have been negotiated and agreed upon.

Lee Stanley with the Division of Workforce Development then presented on the National Toll-Free Help Line established to increase dislocated worker and employer access to public workforce service information. Missouri is one of 9 Phase I "founder" states and has been involved with the program since its beginning. The effort builds on the goals of the National Rapid Response Workgroup and the opportunities presented by the WIA. The US Department of Labor is working with state and local partners to improve access to workforce development services. Specifically, the focus in development is toward the employers and dislocated workers involved in layoff or downsizing situations. It will then expand to include all Employment and Training Administration workforce programs.

Ron Vessell with the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) started the Program Coordination Committee report with a presentation on Ticket to Work. The program is part of the Work Incentive Improvement Act (WIIA), which is designed to reduce work disincentives and expand availability of health care services. The WIIA expands state options and extends Medicare for SSDI beneficiaries. Ron addressed issues surrounding disability and demonstrating eligibility, and the critical nature of health care as factors to address in getting people back on the rolls and what risks are associated with getting off. The Ticket to Work program will involve a three year roll out. Missouri has requested to become one of the rollout states. A "ticket" is not a voucher. It is a ticket to be reimbursed later, as an outcome reimbursement system. There will be an established program manager to identify employment networks and monitor how well they perform. Employment networks are the entities to which a person can take their ticket, and the current law would indicate most employers could become an employment network. Regulations are due in June and are expected to define in greater detail who the employment networks can be. Missouri VR agencies will be mandated to become employment networks, and Ron encouraged all 62 community rehabilitation programs and any agency involved in workforce development to do

so. Payment system options include reimbursement to the employment network after the fact, or to be reimbursed at a rate of 40% of the individual annual benefit amount after that person leaves the rolls. Final regulations are expected by December. States rollout will begin in January 2001.

Fran then reported on the issue of fiscal resource mapping, which was a charge given by the Council to the One-Stop Executive Team at February's MTEC meeting that would examine every feasible source of funding available to assist WIAs that will lose funds under the current "no hold-harmless" policy. A group of volunteer members met with Workforce Development staff via conference call on April 7 and agreed to develop a very brief policy paper and present findings to the Full Council for further discussion. The need to understand what dollars there are, where they come from and the limitations placed on the funds are key to an effective resource mapping project. The Workforce Development Transition team conducted a rudimentary form of resource mapping in 1998. The information required about four months to prepare and is now outdated. The State of Minnesota completed a similar project through the Minnesota General Assembly law requiring agencies provide the information. The following points were reported from the Conference call of the Ad Hoc Committee:

- If work on resource mapping is to continue, it should be assigned to a standing committee.
- There is a national experience with this issue, notably Minnesota.
- This work is a necessary basis for answering the question on the Return on Investment requested by the Governor.
- Missouri recognized the need for resource mapping when reorganizing Departments.
- It has become apparent that current difficulties over cost sharing, cost allocations and possibly other collaborative programs may in part be due to lack of fully shared resource availability.
- The Council has responsibility for recommending planning, monitoring and strategic responses to the Governor, as well as needing to have positions on issues relative to the discharge of its statutory responsibilities.

The Program Coordination Committee's recommendation is that the fiscal resource-mapping project be referred to the Strategic Planning Committee for further research, discussion and action. The motion was seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Fran then addressed the issue of local plan approval. The Committee has received two plans thus far. She asked Roger Baugher of the Division of Workforce Development to briefly explain the process for evaluating plans based on areas of non-compliance, questionable compliance and those needing further clarification under the Workforce Investment Act. The review team for local plans includes various individuals with expertise in all areas of workforce development. The local plan log was distributed, which tracks the date the plan is received, the date of review, and a checklist of required sections that must be submitted with the plan. Roger reviewed the timeline for local plans. The Division had asked that plans be submitted before March 1, 2000. Within a day of receipt, copies of the plans were made and distributed to members of the team for a two-week comment turnaround time. The plans

submitted were then shared with Division management staff to review issues of concern prior to sending letters to Chief Elected Officials. Ron Breshears questioned whether consideration was given to selection of board members pursuant to guidance set forth by the Council. Roger stated this was a consideration, although it was not on the review sheet. Workforce Development staff will provide information to the Program Coordination on the guidance and diversity issues of the workforce investment boards (WIBs). Roger mentioned that boards must be certified before the Division can finalize approval of the local plans. Bev Kelsay then detailed the local plan review matrix, which identifies that plans have met required key components based on the Workforce Investment Act and MTEC guidance. George Eberle suggested that the Strategic Planning Committee identify those elements of the local plans that are critical to elements in the MTEC Strategic Plan.

Fran mentioned that the role of the Program Coordination Committee is to be certain that local plans are in compliance with the WIA. She also mentioned that state partner agencies were very active in local plan review process. Fran detailed the plan specifics for the South Central Region, stating that all lists for future plans will include whether MOUs are in place. Questions regarding the One-Stop Operator and the Grant recipient for the area were addressed, including nature of the Ozarks Community Development Corporation. Fran moved that the Program Coordination Committee has reviewed the local WIA plan submitted by the South Central region. The Committee recommends that a letter of approval be sent to the Chief Local Elected official for the South Central Region. The motion was seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Fran then detailed the Jefferson - Franklin Consortium local plan specifics. Questions were again directed toward the One-Stop Operator for the area as well as the grant recipient. She moved that the Program Coordination Committee has reviewed the local WIA plan submitted by the Jefferson-Franklin consortium. The Committee recommends that a letter of approval be sent to the Chief Local Elected officials for the Jefferson-Franklin Consortium. The motion was seconded. Fran mentioned that if the Plan is approved and doesn't meet requirements, as referenced in the earlier discussion surrounding regional planning issues of this particular plan, how would the Committee be advised to handle other plans coming in that don't meet the same requirements. Catherine Leapheart moved to amend the motion to include that approval of the plan is continued upon satisfactory answer of the three regional planning questions. The amendment was seconded. The amendment passed unanimously. The motion passed unanimously.

Fran then moved that the Program Coordination Committee establish a process to review other local WIA plans prior to the June meeting of the Full Council. Fran mentioned that more than one additional committee meeting might be required. Roger Baugher mentioned concern about plans requesting early Youth funds not being approved by July 1st. Brenda Wrench stated she was interested in seeing the other twelve local plans and knowing they are in compliance with guidelines MTEC has set forth. Jim Dickerson requested that all MTEC members receive information sheets regarding local plan specifics such as those provided on the South Central and Jefferson - Franklin Regions and be notified of Committee review meetings. Joe Driskill reiterated that actual plan approval will come from the Governor, but stated the role of MTEC is importantly to review and comment and make recommendations

in this regard. He suggested a forum be held for interested Council members to come and take part in the review process.

Jim moved to amend the original motion to include that the Program Coordination Committee schedule meetings for plan review and extend invitation to all other MTEC members to attend and to vote. The motion to amend was seconded. The motion to amend passed unanimously. The original motion was then seconded with inclusion of the amendment and passed unanimously. That concluded the Program Coordination Committee report.

Tom Jones then presented the proposal for Public/Private Business/Labor Collaboration, as approved by the Executive Committee and discussed at the February 24th meeting of the Full Council. He mentioned it is the policy of the Missouri Training and Employment Council to broaden the involvement of private sector business/industry and labor representatives and to increase the opportunity for these representatives to provide input and feedback to the Council as customers of the workforce development system.

The proposal would establish a Business/Industry/Labor Leadership Ad Hoc Committee of the Council composed of the following representatives:

- One private sector MTEC member
- One representative from the Associated Industries of Missouri (AIM);
- One representative from the Missouri Chamber of Commerce;
- One member from the Missouri Economic Development Corporation.
- One member from the Missouri Employer Committee; and
- One member from the State Labor Council.

This committee shall function as all other regular committees of the MTEC and serve in an advisory capacity to the Council. It was moved that the Council accept the proposal as presented. The motion was seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

The first session of the Full Council meeting is adjourned.

Friday, April 28, 2000

The first item on the agenda for the second session was a presentation by Mike Pulliam and Roger Baugher on the issue of Workforce Development Outcome Measures. Specifically, the issue surrounded the relationship between the Governor's Show-Me Results measures and the US Department of Labor's reporting requirements for Employment and Training Administration (ETA) funded programs. The recommendation is that the Governor request a waiver to replace 9 WIA Performance Indicators with 4 Governor's Outcomes for WIA Title I and Wagner-Peyser. Reiterating the Governor's four questions:

1. How many people without a job in the year before they made contact with the workforce development system got a job sometime within the year following

- completion of their program?
2. How many of the people who came in contact with the workforce development system are working in the three months after completion? How many are still working after six months, nine months, and twelve months?
 3. How many people who participated in one of the four programs had higher earnings after participation?
 4. How many people who participated in at least one of the workforce development system programs raised themselves above the poverty line after completion of their program?

These have and continue to be addressed in the research efforts of the affected four state Departments and the University of Missouri, Department of Economics.

The Workforce Investment Act requires the reporting of seventeen (17) performance measures. The reportable measures for WIA include separate measures for adult, dislocated worker, older youth and younger youth. In addition, there are two customer satisfaction measures.

Additionally, the Wagner-Peyser Act (Employment Service) ES-9002 contains 88 reportable indicators but has no performance measurement accountability. Fifteen states and the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies (ICESA) currently are participating in a United States Department of Labor workgroup to develop a labor exchange accountability system. This endeavor is following up on the preliminary work accomplished in 1998, which was deferred with passage of the Workforce Investment Act in August of that year. The workgroup is committed to development of a system that mirrors to the extent possible the regulatory requirements of WIA. The preliminary recommendations are as follows.

APPROPRIATENESS OF MEASURES

Focus on primary measures established around employers, job seekers, and customer satisfaction

PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDED MEASURES

1. Entered employment rate (those without a job who became employed)
2. Employment rate (# of people contacting system that are employed)
3. Customer satisfaction, employers
4. Customer satisfaction, job seekers

POTENTIAL RECOMMENDED MEASURES

5. Labor market penetration rate
6. Retention rate
7. Job opening fill rate
8. Employer usage of automated system

The Show-Me Results address intent and mission of the nation and Missouri's workforce development system in quantifiable numbers that are meaningful to the businesses and job

seekers of our state:

- People are working and maximizing their opportunity in the workplace
- Employers have the skilled workforce required to be successful
- The workforce development system facilitates improvement in the above two core values over time

Roger briefly reviewed how the measures were calculated, and presented the advantages of requesting a waiver to use the Governor's Outcomes. Specifically, the waiver would collapse the seventeen WIA performance measures into twelve by combining nine measures into three, maintaining eight and adding one that deals with poverty. The WIA measures only cover WIA Adult, Youth and Dislocated Workers, whereas the Governor's Outcomes cover WIA Adult, Youth, Dislocated Workers and Wagner-Peyser. The WIA measures set rates instead of clear targets and allow for continuous improvement by "ratcheting up" rates that could provide lower numbers served. In contrast, the waiver would give clear numbers rather than rates and would allow target setting for continuous improvement.

Questions regarding the waiver were addressed, including whether or not the University of Missouri research was duplication of this effort. Roger concluded that though the research was tied, but the research focuses on annual statistics, and the Division is required to report out quarterly to the US Department of Labor.

Motion was made to approve the recommendation that the Governor request a waiver to include reporting requirements for Title I of the Workforce Investment Act and the Wagner-Peyser Act. The motion was seconded. George moved to amend the motion to include a footnote that recognizes the Governor's 5th question regarding Return on Investment (ROI). After discussion, the motion to amend was seconded and passed unanimously. The original motion with the amendment passed unanimously.

The Training and Employment Administrators (TEAM) of Missouri presented next. Bob Simpson, President of TEAM, gave the introduction for the group and their purpose for addressing the Council. Bob mentioned that TEAM would like to ask the Council questions regarding processes and practices, and petition for reconsideration of certain points. A list of questions was then presented to the Council. The questions were as follows:

1. Could TEAM expertise be utilized by MTEC in a special advisory capacity similar to that of the One-Stop Executive Team?
2. When will MTEC membership be expanded to include LEO representation?
3. What can be (will be) done to remedy the convoluted decision-making and problem-solving patterns which are frustrating private sector WIB members and impeding progress?
4. Who can we call to get timely answers to particular questions when the normal communication channels are unresponsive?
5. Why isn't the technology gap, which is compromising our ability to document and validate performance being closed more rapidly?
6. Can we expect detailed guidance or technical assistance for creating comprehensive

- cost allocation systems and standards?
7. Is there any possibility that MTEC would be willing to reconsider its "No Hold Harmless" decision?
 8. If not "Hold Harmless," what are the concrete, specific alternatives for assistance which will be provided to the "endangered" areas?

Betty Trimble, Administrative Entity Director for the Northwest Region, presented the purpose and mission of TEAM as providing a forum for structured interaction among the Administrative Entities, and to assist the state in establishing plans that address local needs of the customers. She gave background on TEAM and listed its history of success in the areas of Workforce Development.

Darrell Decker, Associate Commissioner of Greene County, spoke next to the Council and relayed concerns from the standpoint of a local elected official in attempting to meet deadlines and operate in challenging circumstances. He encouraged that provision of services, not structure, be the foremost concern. He requested clear communication between partners.

Bob Simpson then addressed the issue of technical priority, specifically, of the rumored deterioration of ALMIS (America's Labor Market Information System) and the cost allocation system and standards.

Marilyn Beasley, Vice-Chairman for the Private Industry Council (PIC) in the Southwest Region and Chair for the Committee that formulated the plan under WIA for the area, shared her perspective on the planning process and the PIC to WIB transition. She mentioned difficulty in 4 areas:

1. The PIC being the entity responsible for developing the plan,
2. the perceived, vagueness in areas of the ACT pertaining to the One-Stop Operator, administrative costs and state agency contributions,
3. the process for MOUs, and
4. the budget decrease inherent in the No Hold Harmless policy.

The board transition has been difficult, as the scope of the WIB is greater and will have greater oversight for several agencies. She mentioned that the state might have held forums to include all concerned in the policy issues, such as MTEC members, PIC administrators, County Commissioners and the Division of Workforce Development. She mentioned that success will determine the continuation of services. She asked if the Council might reconsider the decision not to implement the hold harmless provision, or provide concrete, specific alternatives for assistance.

Council discussion followed. Fran reiterated the issue of fiscal resource mapping referred to the Strategic Planning Committee for further research and action, and that this process will produce those concrete, specific alternatives. George mentioned apparent confusion in interpretation of the Act and suggested that the Council refer specific answers to questions and form a dialogue for locals, state staff and MTEC to interpret the Act. Joe Driskill stated

some questions have already been answered, and although many of the questions involve staff, those pertaining to Council decisions do not. George suggested the Council acknowledge and respect the position of the presenters and expedite the process of dialogue through the Executive Committee. Patti stated she would work with Division staff to set up the meeting upon her return from out of state on May 15th. She then mentioned the next Full meeting of MTEC would occur on June 1, with Committee meetings occurring prior to with regard to local plan components.

Ron Breshears asked what the worst case scenario would be if local plans are not approved by June 30. Bob Wilson from the United States Department of Labor stated he could not speak for the state, but that on a federal level, the agency is creating a list of absolutes that areas must meet in the local plans, or the area will not be funded. He further stated that DOL's position remains that those receiving services will continue to do so after July 1st. However, Youth services portion of local plans have to be approved before release of 25% will be granted to the area. Mike Pulliam stated he would seek legal counsel get the state's official answer to Ron's question.

Gay Larsen, staff for the Ozarks Region operator made public comment on perceived communication and program deficiencies brought on by customers and employees operating in "limbo," i.e. without an approved plan.

Patti asked for any further public or council comment.

The meeting was adjourned.

MISSOURI TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT COUNCIL

April 27-28, 2000

Holiday Inn University Plaza Hotel
Springfield, MO

ATTENDEES

MEMBERS:

Patti Penny, Chair, George Eberle, Fred Grayson, John Dial, Jim Dickerson, Catherine Leapheart, Ron Breshears, Joe Driskill, Bill Treece, Fran Brothers, Virginia Mee, Mikki Brewster, Dr. Wayne Giles, Nick Nichols, Brenda Wrench, Ron Vessell, Mike O'Mara, Dru Nugent for Herb Johnson

STAFF AND GUESTS

Tom Jones, Mike Pulliam, Bob Wilson, Marvin Freeman, Mark Mehmert, Bob Hall, Sally Howard, Sondra Larson, Tracy Lerbs, Shirley Click, Larry Hightower, Glenn Stinson, Ron Jewell, Amy Deem, Molly Bunton, Lee Stanley, Jan Vaughn, Jon Hoag, Steve Kraus, Alice Simpson, Jaydean Miller, Gay Larson, Betty Trimble, Tony Hiesberger, Kim Lightfoot, Lynn Hatfield, Clinton Flowers, Mark Bauer, Rick Beasley, Mike Shepard, Bob Simpson, Neal Ball, Lindell Thurman, Jim Orr, Ceil Callahan, Rex Hall, Don Eisinger, Bev Kelsay, Roger Baugher, Bill Ander, Charles Matthews, Marilyn Beasley, Ron Ferguson, James B. Hair,

